

**Wilson, Erika**

---

**From:** Puchalski, Melissa  
**Sent:** Monday, March 18, 2013 12:57 PM  
**To:** Gary Lear  
**Cc:** Haeuber, Richard; Lear, Gary  
**Subject:** RE: FW: KS monitor  
**Attachments:** potential\_o3\_exceedance.pptx

Rick,

I used the 2011-2012 ozone data (not a 3-year average) because this is when the monitors became part 58 compliant. Let me know if you would like it displayed differently.

Melissa

---

**From:** Gary Lear [mailto:gglear@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, March 18, 2013 12:11 PM  
**To:** Puchalski, Melissa  
**Cc:** Haeuber, Richard; Lear, Gary  
**Subject:** RE: FW: KS monitor

Melissa gave a very good response on the siting criteria. [REDACTED]

On Mar 18, 2013 11:22 AM, "Puchalski, Melissa" <[Puchalski.Melissa@epa.gov](mailto:Puchalski.Melissa@epa.gov)> wrote:

Rick,

There are siting criteria for the geographic area around the site and siting criteria for the inlet. 40 CFR appendix D describes the siting criteria and objectives a regulatory monitor must meet. The CFR describes criteria for sites designated as urban, regional, or neighborhood scale.

This is the siting criteria for a regional O<sub>3</sub> monitoring site:

(3) *Regional scale* —This scale of measurement will be used to typify concentrations over large portions of a metropolitan area and even larger areas with dimensions of as much as hundreds of kilometers. Such measurements will be useful for assessing the O<sub>3</sub> that is transported to and from a metropolitan area, as well as background concentrations. In some situations, particularly when considering very large metropolitan areas with complex source mixtures, regional scale sites can be the maximum concentration location.

(h) For regional scale background monitoring sites, similar meteorological analysis as for the maximum concentration sites may also inform the decisions for locating regional scale sites. Regional scale sites may be located to provide data on O<sub>3</sub> transport between cities, as background sites, or for other data collection purposes.

Consideration of both area characteristics, such as meteorology, and the data collection objectives, such as transport, must be jointly considered for a regional scale site to be useful.

[REDACTED]

Gary, what do you think? [REDACTED]

Melissa

---

**From:** Haeuber, Richard  
**Sent:** Monday, March 18, 2013 9:31 AM  
**To:** Gary Lear  
**Cc:** Lear, Gary; Puchalski, Melissa  
**Subject:** RE: FW: KS monitor

The new Remote Access is just a joy to use.....

So, you'll both see that I constructed an answer based on your replies – thanks for getting back to me so quickly and thoroughly. A couple of follow-up requests from Reid:

1. Near term – [REDACTED]

2. Longer term – [REDACTED]

---

**From:** Gary Lear [<mailto:gglear@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 17, 2013 3:23 PM  
**To:** Haeuber, Richard  
**Cc:** Lear, Gary; Puchalski, Melissa  
**Subject:** Re: FW: KS monitor

[illegible]

0CFR Part 58 requires adequate QA/QC if a monitor is used for regulatory purposes, but it also requires EPA to use a monitor for non-attainment determinations if the monitor has the required QA/QC . We were criticized for not having sufficient QA/QC for our ozone measurements, and this deficiency limited the comparability of our measurements with the largest network of ozone measurements (i.e., SLAMS). In responding to that criticism and improving the QA/QC of CASTNET ozone measurements we had little choice but to allow them to be used for non-attainment determinations.

\_\_\_\_\_

100

\_\_\_\_\_

0CFR Part 58 requires adequate QA/QC if a monitor is used for regulatory purposes, but it also requires EPA to use any monitor that does have the required QA/QC for non-attainment determinations. We were criticized for not having sufficient QA/QC for our ozone measurements, and this deficiency limited the comparability of our measurements with the largest network of ozone measurements (i.e., SLAMS). In responding to that criticism and improving the QA/QC of CASTNET ozone measurements we little choice but to allow them to be used for non-attainment determinations.

As I see it,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

On Sat, Mar 16, 2013 at 12:40 PM, Lear, Gary <[Lear.Gary@epa.gov](mailto:Lear.Gary@epa.gov)> wrote:

---

From: Haeuber, Richard  
Sent: Saturday, March 16, 2013 12:40:15 PM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada)  
To: Lear, Gary; Puchalski, Melissa  
Subject: FW: KS monitor

Gary, Melissa - can we discuss this first thing Monday AM?

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Maybe you can just respond to this email and that can take the place of talking on Monday....but, we do need to respond to Janet quickly.

Thanks

---

From: Harvey, Reid  
Sent: Friday, March 15, 2013 7:03 PM  
To: Haeuber, Richard  
Subject: Fw: KS monitor

Could you let me know how we can best respond to Janet's questions?

Thanks

---

From: McCabe, Janet  
Sent: Friday, March 15, 2013 6:05:15 PM  
To: Harvey, Reid; Koerber, Mike  
Subject: KS monitor

I talked to Becky.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Becky said there's a call with KS next thursday and she's going to set up an internal epa call before then.

[REDACTED]